

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 27, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 22, and 23 to clarify that an event may be removed from a memory of the network management system depending on a severity indicator. Applicants have amended claim 13 to include determining if the received Trap is a reportable condition. Applicants have also amended claim 19 to include the limitation of determining if an event has already been logged a predetermined number of times in an event list. For the above amendments see, e.g., Applicants' Specification, page 10, lines 21-29; page 15 lines 11-17, and page 17 lines 19-28. Thus, Applicants believe that no new matter has been added. Applicants have also amended claims 14-15 and 24-25 to correct for dependencies. Applicants submit that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request notice to this effect.

1. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections Based on Justice/Roytman

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,418,469 ("Justice") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,282 ("Roytman"). In amended claims 1, 8, 22, and 23 Applicants recite a system or method for processing network management data received by a network management system during the monitoring of a network. Such a system receives network management data, determines if the network management data indicates the resolution of a previous event, changes a severity indicator of the event, and removes the event from a memory associated with the network management system, where the removal is dependent on the severity indicator. For example, "if the severity for resolved events is reduced to 'Low,' management systems with limited memory space for the event

log will automatically preferentially delete these events.” (Applicant’s Specification, page 10, lines 26-29.)

In contrast, Justice, which is generally directed to managing conditions in a network of network devices, does not disclose changing a severity indicator and removing the event depending on the severity indicator, as recited in the claims 1,8, 22, and 23. Indeed, the Examiner conceded that “Justice does not explicitly disclose changing a severity indicator of said previous event dependent on said determining step.”

The Examiner cited Roytman for the teaching of changing a severity indicator and removing the event depending on the severity indicator. However, this teaching does not overcome the deficiencies described above with respect to Justice. Instead, Roytman is related to alarm management, and discloses an alarm manager that may “summarize, sort, and prioritize alarm information.” (Roytman, col. 2, lines 58-63). Roytman describes how an operator may setup sorting criteria or operational modes (See, e.g., Roytman, abstract), but does not teach or describe the removal of an event from memory based on a severity indicator. Applicants maintain, therefore, that merely sorting or arranging alarm information cannot be construed to be the same as removing the event from memory based on the severity indicator.

Because neither Justice nor Roytman show or suggest removing the event from a memory of the network management system, depending on the severity indicator, the combination of Justice and Roytman does not show or suggest all the elements of claims 1, 8, 22, and 23. Thus, Applicants believe that the claims 1, 8, 22, and 23 are not obvious in light of the combination of Justice and Roytman.

With regard to claim 13, Applicants include the limitation of determining if the received Trap is a reportable condition. For example, after a Trap’s relevancy has been determined, the network

management system establishes whether the Trap is reportable or not. Advantageously, relevant Trap's may still be filtered out as unreportable even though deemed relevant. The newly amended limitation of claim 13 is absent from both Justice and Roytman, therefore, the combination of Justice and Roytman does not show or suggest all the elements of claim 13. Thus, claim 13 is not obvious in light of the combination of Justice and Roytman.

Similarly, with regard to claim 19, Applicants include the limitation of determining if an event has already been logged a predetermined number of times in an event list. In the Examiner's rejection of claim 19, the Examiner asserted that the log disclosed by Justice "represents the list of action and recurring action." In addition, the Examiner referred to various repeated events referred to in Justice, namely "upgrade system Rom" and "event 11000". However, Justice does not disclose an event being logged a *predetermined* number of times. In contrast, although these repeated events have occurred multiple times, Justice does not disclose the network management system logging a predetermined number. Instead, and at most, the events described in Justice have occurred a random number of times, which is not construable to a predetermined number of times. Therefore, because neither Justice nor Roytman show or suggest an event being logged a predetermined number of times, the combination of Justice and Roytman does not show or suggest all the elements of claims 19. Thus, Applicants believe that claim 19 is not obvious in light of the combination of Justice and Roytman.

Claims 2-7, 11-12, and 14-16 depend from claim 1. Claims 9-10 depend from claim 8. Claims 20-21 depend from claim 19. Claims 24-25 depend from claim 23. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 2-7, 9-12, 20-21, and 24-25 are not obvious in light of the combination of Justice and Roytman for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 1, 8, 13, 19, 22, and 23.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

2. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections Based on Justice/Roytman/Gaffaney

The Examiner rejected claims 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Justice in view of Roytman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,008 ("Gaffaney"). Claims 17-18 depend from claim 1. As described above, the combination of Justice and Roytman does not show or suggest removing an event from memory, depending on the severity indicator. Gaffaney was cited for the respective teachings that the time difference is greater than a predetermined time interval and determining that the event is resolved. (Office Action, page 9) However, these teachings do not overcome the deficiencies found in the combination of Justice and Roytman. Thus, Applicants believes that claims 17-18 are not obvious in light of the combination of Justice, Roytman, and Gaffaney

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests notice to this effect. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative below if any questions arise or she may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 25, 2006

By: 

John G. Tolomei
Reg. No. 57,846